



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

fire. Synonyms are often dormant; are they then to be always dormant? We may use 'authentic' and 'genuine' as loose equivalents, 'expectation' and 'anticipation' as identical, and then again we may distinguish sharply between them. Grammar cannot be reduced to mathematical rules; we are often reminded of that. But is it true that masses of phenomena are of no account, that sphere of usage is of no account? I have called *ἐάν* the legal condition; I should not hesitate to call *ὅπως ἂν* the legal expression of finality; and I contend that one learns much more of a language by such observations as to sphere and mass of use than by any number of vague formulae. That Homer does not bear out such a difference in tone between *εἰ* w. f. ind. and *ἦν* with subj. in alternatives I know full well. I myself pointed out the passage which Prof. Clapp adduces, and I know, moreover, that the usage of Herodotos is not exactly in line with Attic usage, as is shown by a special study which one of my students made of the conditional sentence in Herodotos, although the malign and the pitiless may be found in Herodotos also. The tone is no fancy, and so I find Prof. Campbell saying in the second ed. of his *Theaetetus* (161 D): 'The fut. ind. is often used in dwelling on a supposition which is unendurable,' and citing So. Phil. 988: *εἰ μ' οὐτως ἐκ τῶν σῶν ἀπάξεται βίη*. But the indisputable fact which I have established that *εἰ* w. fut. ind. is used in the Tragic Poets out of proportion to the usage elsewhere, is enough to stamp this conditional form with the hard character claimed for it. Still, nothing was further from my mind than to make the minatory and monitory use the exclusive one, and the rules which I gave in the Proceedings of the Am. Phil. Assoc. for 1876 (p. 17) will cover the Attic usage:

"*εἰ* with the fut. indic. is used *chiefly*:

1. In minatory and monitory conditions.
2. Where the fut. is used in a modal sense, with translation 'is to,' 'must,' etc.
3. In connection with verbs and phrases of emotion (semi-causal), such as *αἰσχύνομαι*, *ἐλεῶ*, *δεινόν*, *αἰσχρόν* κ. τ. λ."—(which class, I may add, might readily be made to swell the impugned No. 1).

B. L. G.

Verner's Law in Italy. By R. S. CONWAY. Trübner, 1887.

That too many exceptions to the law of rhotacism in Latin exist has been felt by many scholars, but no one has ventured a theory that would explain them *en masse*. They have been dealt with singly and explained as borrowed words, or as originating after rhotacism was complete, or else as deriving their *s* from an original *ss*. With all this, however, it is troublesome to find an explanation for such words as *miser*, *rosa*, *asinus*, *vasum*, etc. Looking at these facts, and bearing in mind the brilliant discovery of Verner, which explained the variation of *s* and *r* in Teutonic as due to accent, and noting further the change of final *s* to *r* in Sanskrit under certain conditions, Mr. Conway was led to try the application of Verner's law to Latin and the other Italic dialects. This idea was, no doubt, perfectly original with Mr. Conway, but, as was pointed out by a reviewer in "The Nation," May 17, 1888, the identical suggestion was made by Bugge in the *Rheinisches*

Museum, XL, p. 475. So striking is the coincidence that we will be pardoned for quoting the passage. "Ich vermuthe, dass die Verschiedenheit hier wie in deutsch. *kiesen* neben *erkoren* . . . zu erklären ist. Einst hatte das Italische variirende Betonung wie das Griechische und das Indische. Zu jener Zeit galt nach meiner Vermuthung die folgende Lautregel: Intervokalisches *s* erhielt sich nach betontem Vokale als tonloses *s*; wurde aber tönend (*z*, später *r*), wo der nächstvorhergehende Vokal nicht den Hauptton trug." The conclusions to which Mr. Conway was brought are as follows: Medial *s* between vowels following an unaccented syllable became *r* in Latin, Umbrian, and other rhotacising dialects, while it appears as *z* in Oscan and other non-rhotacising dialects; following an accented syllable, it was kept in all dialects except in Latin and Faliscan, where it became even then *r*, if it was followed by *i* or *u* and preceded by *i*, *u*, or a long vowel or diphthong. The most striking testimony to the correctness of this theory comes from the Umbrian. Here Mr. Conway finds 28 examples of *s* retained between two vowels after the accent, as *dsa*, *séso*, *dse*, etc. Against these there are only seven cases where *r* is found under similar conditions, and most of these admit of explanation, being words that may have been used without accent, as enclitics, for they are either pronouns or parts of the verb *to be*. Further, there are seven examples of *r* representing *s* between vowels and not preceded by an accent, to which list there is only one exception, the ending *-asius*. This he thinks was borrowed from a non-rhotacising dialect. Oscan is not so rich in examples as the Umbrian, but shows eight instances of *s* retained between vowels at the end of the first syllable, and four instances of *z* after an unaccented syllable. The other dialects do not afford material enough for positive decision.

When we come to the Latin the question is more difficult. According to Conway's theory, all the old *cruces* disappear, and *casa*, *vasum*, *nasus*, etc. (28 examples in all), become regular and law-abiding. The numerous changes of *s* to *r* in unaccented syllables, too, offer no difficulty. In most of the cases where *r* is found after an accented syllable, the change is due to the presence of a following *i* or *u*, according to the rule stated above. The elimination of this category is possibly the most brilliant part of Mr. Conway's work. That *i* and *u* may have had such an effect he clearly demonstrates by a careful examination of their phonetic character. No vowels are so positive in their nature and effects as these two, as is attested by the wide-spread influence of epenthesis and umlaut, and by the phenomena of palatalization and labialization in general. It is interesting to compare what Mr. Conway says on this point, especially his note (p. 13) on the Slavonic change of *s* to *ch*, with an article by Rudolph Lenz, *Zur Physiologie und Geschichte der Palatalen*, Kuhn's Zeitschrift XXIV, p. 50 ff. Some of the words which show *r* due to the presence of *i* or *u*, are *equivria*, *serit* (**sisit*), *gerit* (**gisit*), *nurus*, *telluris*, *Furius*, *urit*, *nefarius*, *feriae*, etc. There still remains, however, a number of words which have admitted rhotacism after an accented syllable, and for which our author has only presumable explanations to offer. Such are *ara*, *aurum*, *cura*, *lira*, *virus*, *eram*, *os* : *oris*, *mos* : *moris*, *dare*, and a few others. Of these, *oris* and *moris* seem to have followed the analogy of *laboris*; *dare* may owe its *r* to

the compounds *prodere*, *dedere*, etc., while *eram*, *fore*, etc., just as Umbrian *erom*, show the unaccented, enclitic form. In *ara*, *aurum*, *cura*, *lira*, and *virus* Mr. Conway sees the working of analogy, *ara* following *avere* (cf. Varro, L. L. 5, 38); *aurum*, *aurora*; *cura*, *curare*; *lira*, *delirus*, and *delirare*; *virus*, *vis*: *vires*. In this last word, where the analogy is harshest, it is strange our author failed to see how easily the rhotacism could be explained through the presence of *i* and *u* on each side of *s*. *Virus* clearly belongs in the list of such words as *luridus*, *caeruleus*, etc. With regard to the date of rhotacism, the heretofore assumed limits, viz. 450–350 B. C., are ingeniously supported by a passage from Livy not before noticed, which gives 462 B. C. as the *terminus a quo*.

We come now to the crucial test of Conway's theory, the conclusions it leads to in regard to Latin accent. Bugge conjectured that the old Indo-European accent was in force at the time of this change, a supposition on its face very unlikely, considering what we know of the date of rhotacism in Latin, and the early prevalence of an Italic regressive accent system. The examples of rhotacism, too, seem to refute such a theory. With regard to the system of Latin accent prevailing at the time there are three possibilities; it may have been either the Italic first syllable accent, the classical system, or some compromise between the two. When the shifting from the earlier to the classical system took place has never been settled. Mr. Conway thinks the new system was not fully established until about 200 B. C., for "such contractions as *optumus*, *reccidi*, *imperi*, clearly point to the retention of the first syllable accent in words of this shape till a fairly late era." The rhotacism, too, in *Valerius*, *Veturius*, *gloria* < **gleuoria*, and its absence in *caesaries*, *Masurius*, points to accented first syllable retained till the time in which this law was alive had passed. On the other hand there are seventeen words with *r* which cannot be explained by the oldest system of accent, but which demand the classical law, e. g. *harēna*, *arēre*, *curāre*, *sorōris*, *gerēbam*, *Laurētum*, etc.; there are likewise four words with *s*, whose retention is due to the same classical accent, viz. *agāsō*, *equāsō*, *immāsulus*, *Aenēsi*. These apparently contradictory conditions Mr. Conway attempts to reconcile by assuming an intermediate stage of accent in which "it had become bound by quantity, i. e. could not go further back than a long penult or antepenult, but had not become bound by the number of syllables, that is, restricted to the last three, even when the penult and antepenult were both short." This theory is possible, yet one cannot but hold that the proof here adduced is insufficient. If *reccidi*, *imperi*, *optumus* point to the retention of the first syllable accent on words "of this shape till a fairly late era," will not *conscendo*, *accentus*, *festras* < *fenestras* point to the same thing in spite of long penults? The argument from rhotacism seems to point to the classical system of accent, with special retention, however, of the first syllable accent in a few cases, which are, with but two exceptions, satisfactorily explained by Mr. Conway himself: genitive plurals, as *mēnsarum*, kept the accent on the first syllable by force of the other cases, *mēnsa*, *mēnsam*, etc.; and the words *Vālerius*, *Vētūrius*, *Māsurius*, being proper names (cf. Quintil. I 5, 22), naturally retain their old accent longer. There are left only the two words *caesaries* and

gloria < **gleuoria*. Surely these two examples are not a sufficient basis for a theory of accent.

The conclusion to which we are led after a careful reading of this work is that the true explanation of rhotacism has been reached, and is to be found in the absence of accent from the preceding syllable, or in the presence of an *i* or *u* vowel near the *s*. It also appears, to this reviewer at least, that the classical laws of accent prevailed in the main even then, exceptions being only a few proper names, forms held by system bonds and such like.

Mr. Conway's book is worthy of all praise. In formulating his law and in tracing the influence of *i* and *u*, he has shown a mind keenly sensitive to linguistic phenomena. In working up his material he shows thorough acquaintance with the most advanced German authorities and the conscientious painstaking of a true scholar. Aside from the main line of his investigations, many questions are touched suggestively and helpfully. He seems to have finally refuted the theory of Italic pro-ethnic *ss* from Indo-European *-t-t-*. His derivation of *causa* (p. 72) is alluring and seems just. In an appendix he treats "final *s* in Aryan and the change of *s* to *r* in Sanskrit," linking his discussion to the views expressed by Bloomfield in an article in A. J. P. III, p. 25, to Osthoff's reply thereto in his *Geschichte des Perfects*, and to Brugmann's statements in his *Grundriss*. As the result of his discussion he suggests a scheme founded in the main on Bloomfield's theory, but slightly modifying it. We predict many more papers of value from Mr. Conway's pen.

J. H. KIRKLAND.